

NEWS RELEASE



OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA San Diego, California

***United States Attorney
Karen P. Hewitt***

For Further Information, Contact: Assistant U.S. Attorney Alessandra P. Serano (619) 557-7084

For Immediate Release

NEWS RELEASE SUMMARY - August 23, 2007

United States Attorney Karen P. Hewitt announced that Matthew Tevis Passaro was arraigned today in federal court in San Diego before Magistrate Judge Nita L. Stormes on a single count indictment charging him with failing to register as a sex offender, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2250, a felony. Passaro entered a plea of not guilty. The defendant was previously arraigned on a criminal complaint and ordered detained.

The indictment alleges that in April 2004, Passaro was convicted of sexual assault in Union County, New Jersey, and thereafter Passaro traveled in interstate and foreign commerce and failed to register and update a sex offender registration, as required by the statute.

On July 27, 2006, President Bush signed into law the "Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006." Part of the Act included the "Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act" ("SORNA") codified as Title 18, United States Code, Section 2250, which makes it a federal felony offense to fail to register as a sex offender. The Act also mandated the creation of a national sex offender registry accessible via the

internet and requires every jurisdiction to maintain a sex offender registry with certain information set forth in SORNA, including name, aliases, address, social security number, place of employment and/or school, and vehicle information.

This case is the result of an investigation by the United States Marshals Service.

DEFENDANT

Case Number: 07CR2308BEN

MATTHEW T. PASSARO

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

Title 18, United States Code, Section and 2250 (Failing to Register as a Sex Offender)
Penalties: Up to 10 years' incarceration and \$250,000 fine

AGENCY

United States Marshal's Service

An indictment is not evidence that the defendant committed the crimes charged. The defendant is presumed innocent until the Government meets its burden in court of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.